

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/530,447

Applicant(s)

KAMI ET AL.

Examiner

Marc A Patterson


Art Unit

1772

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc A Patterson.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Tipton Jennings 

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 5/17/04

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: all of the record

Identification of prior art discussed: all of the record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The claimed invention vs. the prior art of record, specifically whether the mechanical differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are sufficient to distinguish between the claimed invention and the prior art. A proposed amendment, adding new limitations to Claims 9, 10 and 17 will be submitted, and Claims 10 and 17 will be checked for possible redundancy. Some of the relevance of Boesch and Stoney was also discussed, specifically the lack of overlap, in the present case, between the claimed invention and prior art, and the absence a reference suggesting the experimentation needed.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required